

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ULYSSES D. REED,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 08-12140

NCO PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT, CITIBANK,  
and 36TH DISTRICT COURT,

Honorable Arthur J. Tarnow

Defendants.

/

**ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO DISMISS [11, 14, 19] AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT**

Before the court are the three motions to dismiss, filed by each of the defendants.

Plaintiff Reed has not responded. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(e)(2), the court will decide this motion on the briefs.

The 36<sup>th</sup> District Court, as an “arm of the state,” is protected from suit by state-sovereign immunity and the Eleventh Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. *See S.J. v. Hamilton County, Ohio*, 374 F.3d 416, 421-422 (6th Cir. 2004) (“Such courts are the adjudicative voice of the state itself. That is particularly true in the context of a court system that, like Ohio’s, is mandated by the state constitution to be uniform and to be supervised by one supreme court”) (dictum) (citations and quotation marks omitted).

This court lacks jurisdiction over the complaint as to the two remaining defendants, because of the *Rooker–Feldman* doctrine. Reed’s complaint in substance challenges the default judgment entered against him in state court. The source of his injury is the state court’s decision, which he, in the end, invites this court to review. Therefore, this court lacks jurisdiction.

*Lawrence v. Welch*, 531 F.3d 361, 368 (6th Cir. 2008).

The motions to dismiss are GRANTED. The complaint is DISMISSED.

SO ORDERED.

S/ARTHUR J. TARNOW

Arthur J. Tarnow  
United States District Judge

Dated: January 26, 2009

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on January 26, 2009, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/THERESA E. TAYLOR

Case Manager

Arthur J. Tarnow

Dated: United States District Judge